

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ BLACK BORDERS
- ☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- ☐ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- ☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
- ☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
- ☐ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
- ☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
- ☐ OTHER: _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/834,701 | 04/12/2001 | Tom Ren | REN,01B | 5019 |
| 7590 | | 09/13/2004 | EXAMINER | |
| Tim W. Curington | | TRUONG, CAM Y T | | |
| 17427 Rolling Creek | | ART UNIT | | |
| Houston, TX 77090 | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| | | 2172 | | |

DATE MAILED: 09/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/834,701 | 04/12/2001 | Tom Ren | REN,01B | 5019 |

7590
Tim W. Curington
4035 Oakridge Street
Houston, TX 77009

08/13/2004

EXAMINER

TRUONG, CAM Y T

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2172

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/834,701

Applicant(s)

REN ET AL.

Examiner

Cam Y T Truong

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 June 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 17-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 17-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant has amended claims 1, 17 in the amendment filed on 12/15/03. Claims 1-12 and 17-23 are pending in this Office Action.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12 and 17-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 7, 9, 11, 12 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al (or hereinafter "Anderson") (US 6144959) in view of Robertson (USP 6269369).

As to claim 1, Anderson teaches the claimed limitations

"creating an access account for each individual record" as creating a user account for each user (col. 17, lines 1-5);

"transmitting the access account to the non-registered individuals" as transmitting password to access account to the user has no account (col. 17, lines 1-25);

"enabling remote maintain of the individual records by use of access account" as maintaining user records (col. 17, lines 55-67).

Anderson does not explicitly teach the claimed limitations:

"receiving records of individuals from an existing database automatically and without registration by the individuals; populating a web-based database with the individual records of the non-registered individual".

Robertson teaches that each first user, the present invention maintains a database of information about the second users to whom the first user has established a link. The personal address book of the first user contains the information in the data fields that the second users have given the first user permission to view. Whenever a second user changes any information in any data field of his data record, the information in that field is automatically updated in the information database of each first user whom he has given permission to view the information in that data field. When the system automatically updates any data field of the first users by using changed field of the second user, the system automatically receives change of any data field of the second users and automatically populate changed field of the second users in the data field of the first user (col. 3, lines 10-25).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Robertson's teaching of each first user, the present invention maintains a database of information about the second users to whom the first user has established a link. The personal address book of the first user contains the information in the data fields that the second users have given the first user permission to view. Whenever a second user changes any information in any data field of his data record, the information in that field is

automatically updated in the information database of each first user whom he has given permission to view the information in that data field to Anderson's system in order to eliminate user's interaction and to eliminate steps of processing for populating data in a database.

As to claim 2, Anderson and Robertson disclose the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, Robertson further teaches the claimed limitation "the records are received by transfer across an electronic link" as email address link (col. 8, lines 55-65).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Robertson's teaching of email address link to Anderson's system in order to allow users to access their account.

As to claim 3, Anderson discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, Robertson further teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the electronic link is electronic mail" as (col. 8, lines 55-65).

As to claim 7, Anderson teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the access accounts are generated automatically" as (col. 18, lines 55-60).

As to claim 9, Anderson discloses the claimed limitation subject matter except the claimed limitation "wherein the temporary access accounts are

Art Unit: 2172

transmitted to the individuals by email". Robertson teaches the database 340 that is stored in a server contains contact information entered by registered users. Fig.6 outlines the data structure of the relational database 340 in the preferred embodiment, in which seven tables 350 are employed to enable most of the functionality of the present invention: Customer table 440; Friend table 460; Group Table 400; Affinity Table 420; Address Table 480; Phone Table 500; and Travel Event Table 520. The Customer table 440 contains one record for each unique user. The field in this table is Customer ID 440-2. All information stored in the various database tables relating to a particular member is linked together by a unique number in this field. Other important fields in this table include information used by users to login to the system such as username 440-6 and password 440-8. This information shows that the system creates each user an access account and transmits passwords to users for login the system (fig. 6, col. 4, lines 60-67; col. 5, lines 1-12; col. 10, lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Robertson's teaching of storing personal information for users in database server, providing passwords to users for login the system and modifying any information in any data field of user data record to allow other users viewing the user's record to Reilly's system in order to prevent a user to update a personal account without permission.

As to claim 11, Anderson discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1,

Art Unit: 2172

except the claimed limitation "wherein the remote maintenance occurs across the Internet." Robertson teaches whenever a second user changes any information in any data field of his data record, the information in that field is automatically updated in the information database of each first user whom he has given permission to view the information in that data field (col. 3, lines 15-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Robertson's teaching of whenever a second user changes any information in any data field of his data record, the information in that field is automatically updated in the information database of each first user whom he has given permission to view the information in that data field to Anderson's system in order to prevent a user to update a personal account without permission.

As to claim 12, Anderson discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "wherein the remote maintenance comprises altering the individual records". Robertson teaches whenever a second user changes any information in any data field of his data record, the information in that field is automatically updated in the information database of each first user whom he has given permission to view the information in that data field (col. 3, lines 15-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Robertson's teaching of whenever a second user changes any information in any data field of his data record, the information in that field is automatically updated in the information database of each first user whom

Art Unit: 2172

he has given permission to view the information in that data field to Reilly's system in order to prevent a user to update a personal account without permission.

As to claim 17, Anderson teaches the claimed limitations:

"an account generator provided for creating access numbers for the data records" as (col. 4, lines 40-55);

"a broadcast system provided for distributing the access numbers to the unregistered customer" as (col. 17, lines 1-20);

"an update system provided to enable customer access to the data records by use of the access numbers" as (col. 4, lines 40-55).

Anderson does not clearly teach the claimed limitation "a database automatically populated with existing customer data records without action taken by the customer". Robertson teaches that each first user, the present invention maintains a database of information about the second users to whom the first user has established a link. The personal address book of the first user contains the information in the data fields that the second users have given the first user permission to view. Whenever a second user changes any information in any data field of his data record, the information in that field is automatically updated in the information database of each first user whom he has given permission to view the information in that data field. When the system automatically updates any data field of the first users by using changed field of the second user, the system automatically receives change of any data field of the second users and

automatically populate changed field of the second users in the data field of the first user (col. 3, lines 10-25).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Robertson's teaching of each first user, the present invention maintains a database of information about the second users to whom the first user has established a link. The personal address book of the first user contains the information in the data fields that the second users have given the first user permission to view. Whenever a second user changes any information in any data field of his data record, the information in that field is automatically updated in the information database of each first user whom he has given permission to view the information in that data field to Anderson's system in order to eliminate user's interaction and to eliminate steps of processing for populating data in a database.

4. Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al (or hereinafter "Anderson") (US 6144959) in view of Robertson (USP 6269369) and further in view of Reilly (US 6427164).

As to claim 4, Anderson discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "electronic link is selected from satellite systems, cable systems, direct modem connections, network connections, VPN connections, or Intranet connections". Reilly teaches sending e-mail server then

automatically resends the e-mail message destined for user2 to the new address via network connection (col. 8, lines 30-40; figs 1&2).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Reilly's teaching of sending e-mail server then automatically resends the e-mail message destined for user2 to the new address via network connection to Anderson's system in order to allow users can communicate with the system by using their email addresses.

As to claim 5, Anderson discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation " the populating of the web-based database with the individual records further comprises automatically mapping the records". Reilly teaches that the electronic mail message is sent from the sending server to a receiving server associated with the receipt of the message. In order to accept the electronic mail content from the sending server, the receiving server must generally be able to validate that there is indeed a user name corresponding exactly with the electronic mail receipt's name. The receiving server thus, checks its database of electronic mail users and validates the electronic mail recipient's name (col. 2, lines 25-40; col. 3, lines 20-40).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Reilly's teaching of the electronic mail message is sent from the sending server to a receiving server associated with the receipt of the message. In order to accept the electronic mail content from

the sending server, the receiving server must generally be able to validate that there is indeed a user name corresponding exactly with the electronic mail receipt's name to Anderson's system to update user's records without user's interaction.

As to claim 6, Anderson discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation " wherein the populating of the web-based database with the individual records further comprises manually mapping the records" as the electronic mail message is sent from the sending server to a receiving server associated with the receipt of the message. In order to accept the electronic mail content from the sending server, the receiving server must generally be able to validate that there is indeed a user name corresponding exactly with the electronic mail receipt's name. The receiving server thus, checks its database of electronic mail users and validates the electronic mail recipient's name (col. 2, lines 25-40; col. 3, lines 20-40).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Reilly's teaching of the electronic mail message is sent from the sending server to a receiving server associated with the receipt of the message. In order to accept the electronic mail content from the sending server, the receiving server must generally be able to validate that there is indeed a user name corresponding exactly with the electronic mail

receipt's name to Anderson's system to update user's records without user's interaction.

5. Claims 8 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al (or hereinafter "Anderson") in view of Robertson and further in view Trent et al (or hereinafter "Trent") (US 5961620).

As to claim 8, Anderson discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "wherein the temporary access accounts are transmitted to the individuals by fax". Trent teaches that address book application program maintains an address book information file, which contains a default list of default client communication application programs. The default list specifies a default client communication application program for each of a predetermined set of communication types. For example, predetermined communication types may include fax, video, voice, or e-mail communication type (col. 6, lines 40-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Trent's teaching of communication types may include fax, video, voice or email into Anderson's system in order to allow a system or a user to have more choices in communication with other users or another system.

6. Claim 10, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Robertson and further in view of Trent and Despres et al (USP 6434379).

As to claim 10, Reilly discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "the temporary access accounts are transmitted by a media selected from voice mail, physical address, or pager". Trent teaches that address book application program maintains an address book information file, which contains a default list of default client communication application programs. The default list specifies a default client communication application program for each of a predetermined set of communication types. For example, predetermined communication types may include fax, video, voice, or e-mail communication type (col. 6, lines 40-50). Despres teaches the network sending a voice message to the terminal (col. 3, lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Trent's teaching of communication types may include fax, video, voice or email and Despres's teaching of the network sending a voice message to the terminal into Reilly and Robertson's system in order to allow a system or a user to have more choices in communication with other users or another system.

As to claim 22, Lee and Johnson discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 17, except the claimed limitation "wherein the broadcast, mail, or by pager". Trent teaches that address book application program maintains an address book information file, which contains a default list of default client communication application programs. The default list specifies a default client

communication application program for each of a predetermined set of communication types. For example, predetermined communication types may include fax, video, voice, or e-mail communication type (col. 6, lines 40-50). Also, Despres teaches the network sending a voice message to the terminal (col. 3, lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Trent's teaching of communication types may include fax, video, voice or email and Despres's teaching of the network sending a voice message to the terminal into Lee's system in order to allow a system or a user to have more choices in communication with other users or another system.

As to claim 23, Lee discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 17, except the claimed limitation "wherein the broadcast system distributes the access numbers by a combination of fax, email, and voice mail". Trent teaches that address book application program maintains an address book information file, which contains a default list of default client communication application programs. The default list specifies a default client communication application program for each of a predetermined set of communication types. For example, predetermined communication types may include fax, video, voice, or e-mail communication type (col. 6, lines 40-50). Despres teaches the network sending a voice message to the terminal (col. 3, lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Trent's teaching of communication types may include fax, video, voice or email and Despres's teaching of the network sending a voice message to the terminal into Lee and Johnson's system in order to allow a system or a user to have more choices in communication with other users or another system.

7. Claims 18, 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Robertson and further in view of Lee.

As to claim 18, Anderson discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 17, except the claimed limitation "wherein the database is a web-based database".

Lee teaches web server (fig.4, col. 5, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lee's teaching of web server to Anderson's system in order to display user records in a web site.

As to claim 19, Anderson discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 17, except the claimed limitation "wherein the customer data records include marketing profiles". Lee teaches providing multiple database records of similar promotional information with different vendors (col. 4, lines 45-55; col. 5, lines 25-45).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lee's teaching of providing multiple database records of similar promotional information with different vendors to Anderson's system in order to allow users to store their records and allow other user to search/retrieve their promotional information.

As to claim 21, Anderson discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 17, except the claimed limitation "wherein the broadcast system distributes the access numbers by email". Lee teaches sending email to that potential recipient (col. 7, lines 20-21; col. 5, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply sending email to that potential recipient to Anderson's system in order to send the access account number to a user and to allow users to access their accounts.

8. Claims 1, 7 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al (or hereinafter "Anderson") (US 6144959) in view of Johnson.

As to claim 1, Robertson teaches the claimed limitations

"creating an access account for each individual record" as creating a user account for each user (col. 17, lines 1-5);

"transmitting the access account to the non-registered individuals" as transmitting password to access account to the user has no account (col. 17, lines 1-25); "enabling remote maintain of the individual records by use of access account" as maintaining user records (col. 17, lines 55-67).

Anderson does not explicitly teach the claimed limitations:

"receiving records of individuals from an existing database automatically and without registration by the individuals; populating a web-based database with the individual records of the non-registered individual".

Johnson teaches that the computer-based system 110 for receiving, storing and processing records for subsequent access by providers. Since the providers send records without the request of the computer-based system 110; the computer-based system 110 receives records automatically (col. 4, lines 40-45).

Johnson also teaches the patient demographic database is automatically populated using information extracted from certain documents (col. 3, lines 19-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Johnson's teaching of the computer-based system 100 for receiving and storing records and automatically populating the patient demographic database using information extracted from certain documents to Anderson's system in order to eliminate user's interaction and to eliminate steps of processing for populating data in a database.

As to claim 7, Anderson teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the access accounts are generated automatically" as (col. 18, lines 55-60).

As to claim 17, Anderson teaches the claimed limitations:

"an account generator provided for creating access numbers for the data records" as (col. 4, lines 40-55);

"a broadcast system provided for distributing the access numbers to the unregistered customer" as (col. 17, lines 1-20);

"an update system provided to enable customer access to the data records by use of the access numbers" as (col. 4, lines 40-55).

Anderson does not clearly teach the claimed limitation "a database automatically populated with existing customer data records without action taken by the customer". However, Johnson teaches the patient demographic database is automatically populated using information extracted from certain documents (col. 3, lines 19-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Johnson's teaching of the patient demographic database is automatically populated using information extracted from certain documents to Anderson's system in order to eliminate user's interaction and to eliminate steps of processing for populating data in a database.

9. Claims 2-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al (or hereinafter "Anderson") (US 6144959) in view of Johnson.

As to claim 2, Anderson discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "the records are received by transfer across an electronic link". Reilly teaches sending e-mail server then automatically resends the e-mail message destined for user2 to the new address (col. 8, lines 30-40).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Reilly's teaching of sending e-mail server then automatically resends the e-mail message destined for user2 to the new address to Anderson's system in order to allow users to access their account.

As to claim 3, Anderson discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "wherein the electronic link is electronic mail". Reilly sending e-mail server then automatically resends the e-mail message destined for user2 to the new address (col. 8, lines 30-40).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Reilly's teaching of sending e-mail server then automatically resends the e-mail message destined for user2 to the new

address to Anderson's system in order allow users can communicate with the system by using their email addresses.

As to claim 4, Anderson discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation " electronic link is selected from satellite systems, cable systems, direct modem connections, network connections, VPN connections, or Intranet connections". Reilly teaches sending e-mail server then automatically resends the e-mail message destined for user2 to the new address via network connection (col. 8, lines 30-40; figs 1&2).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Reilly's teaching of sending e-mail server then automatically resends the e-mail message destined for user2 to the new address via network connection to Anderson's system in order to allow users can communicate with the system by using their email addresses.

As to claim 5, Anderson discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation " the populating of the web-based database with the individual records further comprises automatically mapping the records". Reilly teaches that the electronic mail message is sent from the sending server to a receiving server associated with the receipt of the message. In order to accept the electronic mail content from the sending server, the receiving server must generally be able to validate that there is indeed a user name corresponding

exactly with the electronic mail receipt's name. The receiving server thus, checks its database of electronic mail users and validates the electronic mail recipient's name (col. 2, lines 25-40; col. 3, lines 20-40).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Reilly's teaching of the electronic mail message is sent from the sending server to a receiving server associated with the receipt of the message. In order to accept the electronic mail content from the sending server, the receiving server must generally be able to validate that there is indeed a user name corresponding exactly with the electronic mail receipt's name to Anderson's system to update user's records without user's interaction.

As to claim 6, Anderson discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation " wherein the populating of the web-based database with the individual records further comprises manually mapping the records" as the electronic mail message is sent from the sending server to a receiving server associated with the receipt of the message. In order to accept the electronic mail content from the sending server, the receiving server must generally be able to validate that there is indeed a user name corresponding exactly with the electronic mail receipt's name. The receiving server thus, checks its database of electronic mail users and validates the electronic mail recipient's name (col. 2, lines 25-40; col. 3, lines 20-40).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Reilly's teaching of the electronic mail message is sent from the sending server to a receiving server associated with the receipt of the message. In order to accept the electronic mail content from the sending server, the receiving server must generally be able to validate that there is indeed a user name corresponding exactly with the electronic mail receipt's name to Anderson's system to update user's records without user's interaction.

10. Claims 9, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al (or hereinafter "Anderson") (US 6144959) in view of Johnson and further in view of Robertson.

As to claim 9, Anderson discloses the claimed limitation subject matter except the claimed limitation "wherein the temporary access accounts are transmitted to the individuals by email". Robertson teaches the database 340 that is stored in a server contains contact information entered by registered users. Fig.6 outlines the data structure of the relational database 340 in the preferred embodiment, in which seven tables 350 are employed to enable most of the functionality of the present invention: Customer table 440; Friend table 460; Group Table 400; Affinity Table 420; Address Table 480; Phone Table 500; and Travel Event Table 520. The Customer table 440 contains on record for each unique user. The field in this table is Customer ID 440-2. All information

stored in the various database tables relating to a particular member is linked together by a unique number in this field. Other important fields in this table include information used by users to login to the system such as username 440-6 and password 440-8. This information shows that the system creates each user an access account and transmits passwords to users for logon the system (fig. 6, col. 4, lines 60-67; col. 5, lines 1-12; col. 10, lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Robertson's teaching of storing personal information for users in database server, providing passwords to users for logon the system and modifying any information in any data field of user data record to allow other users viewing the user's record to Reilly's system in order to prevent a user to update a personal account without permission.

As to claim 11, Anderson discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "wherein the remote maintenance occurs across the Internet." Robertson teaches whenever a second user changes any information in any data field of his data record, the information in that field is automatically updated in the information database of each first user whom he has given permission to view the information in that data field (col. 3, lines 15-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Robertson's teaching of whenever a second user changes any information in any data field of his data record, the information in that

Art Unit: 2172

field is automatically updated in the information database of each first user whom he has given permission to view the information in that data field to Anderson's system in order to prevent a user to update a personal account without permission.

As to claim 12, Anderson discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "wherein the remote maintenance comprises altering the individual records". Robertson teaches whenever a second user changes any information in any data field of his data record, the information in that field is automatically updated in the information database of each first user whom he has given permission to view the information in that data field (col. 3, lines 15-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Robertson's teaching of whenever a second user changes any information in any data field of his data record, the information in that field is automatically updated in the information database of each first user whom he has given permission to view the information in that data field to Reilly's system in order to prevent a user to update a personal account without permission.

11. Claims 8 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al (or hereinafter "Anderson") in view of Johnson et al (or hereinafter "Johnson") (US 5664109) and further in view of Trent.

As to claim 8, Anderson discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "wherein the temporary access accounts are transmitted to

Art Unit: 2172

the individuals by fax". Trent teaches that address book application program maintains an address book information file, which contains a default list of default client communication application programs. The default list specifies a default client communication application program for each of a predetermined set of communication types. For example, predetermined communication types may include fax, video, voice, or e-mail communication type (col. 6, lines 40-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Trent's teaching of communication types may include fax, video, voice or email into Anderson's system in order to allow a system or a user to have more choices in communication with other users or another system.

As to claim 20, Lee and Johnson discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 17, except the claimed limitation "wherein the broadcast system distributes the access numbers by facsimile". Trent teaches that address book application program maintains an address book information file, which contains a default list of default client communication application programs. The default list specifies a default client communication application program for each of a predetermined set of communication types. For example, predetermined communication types may include fax, video, voice, or e-mail communication type (col. 6, lines 40-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Trent's teaching of communication types may include fax,

video, voice or email into Lee and Johnson's system in order to allow a system or a user to have more choices in communication with other users or another system.

12. Claims 18, 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Johnson and further in view of Lee.

As to claim 18, Anderson discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 17, except the claimed limitation "wherein the database is a web-based database". Lee teaches web server (fig.4, col. 5, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lee's teaching of web server to Anderson's system in order to display user records in a web site.

As to claim 19, Anderson discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 17, except the claimed limitation "wherein the customer data records include marketing profiles". Lee teaches providing multiple database records of similar promotional information with different vendors (col. 4, lines 45-55; col. 5, lines 25-45).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lee's teaching of providing multiple database records of similar promotional information with different vendors to Anderson's system in order to allow users to store their records and allow other user to search/retrieve their promotional information.

Art Unit: 2172

As to claim 21, Anderson discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 17, except the claimed limitation "wherein the broadcast system distributes the access numbers by email". Lee teaches sending email to that potential recipient (col. 7, lines 20-21; col. 5, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply sending email to that potential recipient to Anderson's system in order to send the access account number to a user and to allow users to access their accounts.

13. Claim 10, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Johnson and further in view of Trent and Despres et al (USP 6434379).

As to claim 10, Reilly discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "the temporary access accounts are transmitted by a media selected from voice mail, physical address, or pager". However, Trent teaches that address book application program maintains an address book information file, which contains a default list of default client communication application programs. The default list specifies a default client communication application program for each of a predetermined set of communication types. For example, predetermined communication types may include fax, video, voice, or e-mail communication type (col. 6, lines 40-50). Despres teaches the network sending a voice message to the terminal (col. 3, lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Trent's teaching of communication types may include fax, video, voice or email and Despres's teaching of the network sending a voice message to the terminal into Reilly and Robertson's system in order to allow a system or a user to have more choices in communication with other users or another system.

As to claim 22, Lee and Johnson discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 17, except the claimed limitation "wherein the broadcast, mail, or by pager". Trent teaches that address book application program maintains an address book information file, which contains a default list of default client communication application programs. The default list specifies a default client communication application program for each of a predetermined set of communication types. For example, predetermined communication types may include fax, video, voice, or e-mail communication type (col. 6, lines 40-50). Despres teaches the network sending a voice message to the terminal (col. 3, lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Trent's teaching of communication types may include fax, video, voice or email and Despres's teaching of the network sending a voice message to the terminal into Lee's system in order to allow a system or a user to have more choices in communication with other users or another system.

As to claim 23, Lee discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 17, except the claimed limitation "wherein the broadcast system distributes the access numbers by a combination of fax, email, and voice mail". However, Trent teaches that address book application program maintains an address book information file, which contains a default list of default client communication application programs. The default list specifies a default client communication application program for each of a predetermined set of communication types. For example, predetermined communication types may include fax, video, voice, or e-mail communication type (col. 6, lines 40-50). Also, Despres teaches the network sending a voice message to the terminal (col. 3, lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Trent's teaching of communication types may include fax, video, voice or email and Despres's teaching of the network sending a voice message to the terminal into Lee and Johnson's system in order to allow a system or a user to have more choices in communication with other users or another system.

Conclusion

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2172

Contact Information


15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam Y T Truong whose telephone number is (703) 605-1169. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cam-Y Truong

8/6/04


SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER